



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/381
4 April 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 4 APRIL 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit herewith the answers of the spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the questions put by the Korean Central News Agency, dated 31 March 1994.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) PAK Gil Yon
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Annex

Answers by a spokesman for the Foreign Ministry of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to questions put by the Korean Central News Agency on 31 March 1994

Question: The United States of America is now justifying its campaign for pressure on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with the allegation that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea did not allow a full inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Please tell me the truth in detail.

Answer: The United States is contending that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must accept a full IAEA inspection, alleging that the recent inspection of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear facilities by IAEA was not satisfactory, but this is quite contrary to the fact.

We are in a unique status after a temporary suspension of the effectuation of our declared withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. So we are not obliged to accept a full inspection by IAEA pursuant to the Safeguards Agreement. Moreover, we have never agreed with the United States and IAEA on it.

We agreed only to an inspection for maintaining the continuity of safeguards. When the scope of the IAEA inspection was agreed upon at the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States contact in New York, in late December 1993, the sides promised that it should be a strictly limited inspection for the maintenance of the continuity of safeguards, not a routine or ad hoc inspection pursuant to the Safeguards Agreement.

At that time, the United States side asked the Democratic People's Republic of Korea not to announce to the world that it would be a limited inspection to save its face. At the New York contact in February, the United States side clarified its position that if an IAEA inspection was made, it would come out to the third round of talks with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, irrespective of the results of the inspection.

The United States, which had promised a limited inspection and asked the Democratic People's Republic of Korea not to open it to the public and stated it would have talks with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, irrespective of the results of the inspection, is now urging the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to accept an additional inspection, charging that it refused to accept a full inspection by IAEA pursuant to the Safeguards Agreement.

This is a self-contradictory act. This fully shows how faithless the United States is.

Question: What does the United States really seek in reversing the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States agreed conclusions and kicking up a row of pressure on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea?

Answer: I think it was motivated by the United States trite hostile policy towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We have honestly discharged our obligation according to the agreed conclusions reached between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States at the New York contact.

The United States, however, had made false promises and it took no action in actuality. Nevertheless, the United States is resorting to pressure on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and war provocation moves, alleging that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has failed to implement the agreement.

How can it be construed otherwise? As we have declared more than once, if the third round of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States talks had been held and the nuclear issue resolved in a package deal, IAEA's routine and ad hoc inspections of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would have been resumed and the exchange of special envoys between the north and the south would have been possible. But the United States intentionally foiled the third round of the talks, which would be the key to the solution of the nuclear issue, setting unjustifiable preconditions. This clearly proves that the United States has no intention to resolve the nuclear issue through negotiation and it is only using the talks to stifle the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and, further, promote its strategic interests in the Asia-Pacific region.

Question: Now that we have undergone an inspection sufficient for the continuity of safeguards as we had agreed with IAEA, the United Nations Security Council has no reason or justification to discuss our issue, has it?

Answer: Of course not. The continued discussions of our issue at the United Nations Security Council under this situation only give the impression that the international Organization is courting the favour of a country. And this may be a living example that even international organizations are used for the attainment of the United States egoistic aim.

The IAEA secretariat made haste with the adoption of a "resolution" distorting the results of the inspection after carrying out the inspection of sufficient scope for the continuity of safeguards, and now the United Nations Security Council is discussing our issue. All this is manipulated behind the scene by the United States-led forces to stifle the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

In case the United Nations Security Council follows the United States, it will seriously harm its authority as an international Organization whose lifeblood is impartiality.

If the United Nations Security Council truly wants to discharge its mission, it must not argue about the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the victim, but argue about the acts of the United States, the assaulter, and put pressure on it. If the United Nations Security Council, departing from the principle of impartiality, defends the United States, the assaulter, for the reason that it is a big Power and puts unwarrantable pressure upon the victim for the reason that it is a small country, the small countries will no more trust the United Nations.

The United Nations Security Council must not be used as a rostrum for putting unreasonable pressure upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea over the nuclear issue.

Question: What measures are needed in your opinion for paving the way for a solution to the nuclear issue?

Answer: The United States must no longer pursue a hostile policy towards Korea, first of all. Since the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula was caused by the United States policy to stifle our system, as mentioned above, if it is to be solved, the United States must take measures first for removing the nuclear threat to us and giving up its hostile policy.

Still today, when the nature of its anti-Democratic People's Republic of Korea moves has been brought to light, the United States is resorting to the row of pressure against us, calling for a United Nations "resolution" and the like. This cannot be justified by anything.

The south Korean authorities must ponder over the lot in which they would find themselves while running about reckless, not knowing their position as now. The United States must sincerely implement the agreed conclusions reached at the contact with us.

It is a violation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States agreed conclusions and a mockery of our sovereignty for the United States to demand a full inspection of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by IAEA and the exchange of special envoys between the north and the south, not implementing its own obligations at all.

Pressure can never be a way to solve the problem but it only makes the situation complicated. It is nonsensical to urge us to accept an additional inspection since we have already accepted, fairly and squarely, an inspection of a scope sufficient for the continuity of safeguards according to our agreement with the United States and IAEA.

If the United States continues to misuse our sincere efforts to resolve the nuclear issue, we would no longer pin hope on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States talks and will counter any pressure to the end.

But, if the United States puts a stop to the international pressure campaign against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and proceeds with the re-establishment of the foundation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States talks, we would not oppose a negotiated solution to the issue.

Our position to resolve the nuclear issue through dialogue is consistent.

The future development and a peaceful solution to the nuclear issue entirely depend on the attitude of the United States.
